

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action dated June 29, 2007. Claim 8 has been canceled. Thus, claims 2-7 and 9-12 and 16-30 are now pending. Claims 16-30 have been withdrawn from consideration in view of the Restriction Requirement.

Claim 2 now stands rejected under Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over JP 09-050019 in view of Sobue (US 6,143,450). This is a new ground of rejection. JP '019 allegedly discloses a parallax barrier 6 on a glass substrate 1, but does not disclose or suggest making an alignment mark with the parallax barrier. Recognizing this flaw in JP '019, the Office Action apparently cites to the alignment mark 3 in the BM of Sobue and contends that it would have been obvious to have used such an alignment mark in JP '019. This Section 103(a) rejection is incorrect and is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

While JP '019 allegedly discloses a parallax barrier 6, the reference does not disclose or suggest making an alignment mark with the parallax barrier. Moreover, Sobue merely discloses making an alignment mark with a BM provided immediately adjacent a color filter layer 6. Thus, anyone arguably trying to combine the alignment mark of Sobue with JP '019 would have provided an alignment mark in JP '019 on the *rear* side of the substrate 1 along with the BM 4 – the way that Sobue teaches. However, this would *not* result in the invention of claim 2 because the alignment mark would be on the opposite side of the substrate compared to that called for in claim 2.

There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in the cited art, or otherwise, of making an alignment mark with the parallax barrier as called for in claim 2. Instead, the cited art teaches away from claim 2 by expressly teaching to form the alignment mark with the BM which would

IMAI et al  
Appl. No. 10/522,601  
September 18, 2007


result in the alignment mark being on the rear side of the substrate 1 in modified JP '019 where the BM 4 is located.

For the above reasons, the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 2 is incorrect and should be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Rhoa', written over a horizontal line.

Joseph A. Rhoa  
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100